	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Notice of Allowability	08/879,070	JOHNSON ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Vanel Frenel	3627	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

All claims being allowable, PROSECUTION ON THE MERITS IS (OR REMAINS) CLOSED in this application. If not included herewith (or previously mailed), a Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85) or other appropriate communication will be mailed in due course. **THIS NOTICE OF ALLOWABILITY IS NOT A GRANT OF PATENT RIGHTS.** This application is subject to withdrawal from issue at the initiative of the Office or upon petition by the applicant. See 37 CFR 1.313 and MPEP 1308.

1. ☒ This communication is responsive to *5/29/07*.

2. ☒ The allowed claim(s) is/are *1-7,11-23*.

3. ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some*   c) ☐ None of the:

        1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

        3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this national stage application from the

          International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * Certified copies not received: _____ .

Applicant has THREE MONTHS FROM THE "MAILING DATE" of this communication to file a reply complying with the requirements noted below. Failure to timely comply will result in ABANDONMENT of this application.
THIS THREE-MONTH PERIOD IS NOT EXTENDABLE.

4. ☐ A SUBSTITUTE OATH OR DECLARATION must be submitted. Note the attached EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT or NOTICE OF INFORMAL PATENT APPLICATION (PTO-152) which gives reason(s) why the oath or declaration is deficient.

5. ☐ CORRECTED DRAWINGS (as "replacement sheets") must be submitted.

    (a) ☐ including changes required by the Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) attached

        1) ☐ hereto or 2) ☐ to Paper No./Mail Date _____ .

    (b) ☐ including changes required by the attached Examiner's Amendment / Comment or in the Office action of

        Paper No./Mail Date _____ .

    Identifying indicia such as the application number (see 37 CFR 1.84(c)) should be written on the drawings in the front (not the back) of each sheet. Replacement sheet(s) should be labeled as such in the header according to 37 CFR 1.121(d).

6. ☐ DEPOSIT OF and/or INFORMATION about the deposit of BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL must be submitted. Note the attached Examiner's comment regarding REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEPOSIT OF BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL.

Attachment(s)

1. ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2. ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3. ☐ Information Disclosure Statements (PTO/SB/08), Paper No./Mail Date _____

4. ☐ Examiner's Comment Regarding Requirement for Deposit of Biological Material

5. ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6. ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413), Paper No./Mail Date _____ .

7. ☐ Examiner's Amendment/Comment

8. ☒ Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance

9. ☐ Other _____ .

SPE AU 3687

DETAILED ACTION

Notice to Applicant

1.   This communication is in response to the Amendment filed on 5/29/07. Claims 1,

11, 13, 14, 18, 20, 21 and 23 have been amended. Claims 8-10 have been cancelled.

Claims 1-7 and 11-23 are pending.

Allowable Subject Matter

2.   Claims 1-7 and 11-23 are allowed. The following is an examiner's statement of

reasons for allowance.

Independent claim 1 is directed to "defining a configured product satisfying the

customer's needs and the desired option selections using one or more solvers

containing logic rules constraining selection of available product options; and identifying

from the inventory of the selling entity one or more available products that most closely

matches the configured product having the desired option selections of the customer

based on the value input associated with the desired options selections, when an

identified available product that exactly corresponds to the configured product is not

found in the inventory of the selling entity".

The closest prior art of record, Dworkin (4,992,940) discloses system and

method for automated selection of equipment for purchase through input of user desired

specifications.

Joseph (5,878,401) discloses sales and inventory method and apparatus.

Bennett et al. (4,591,983) discloses hierarchical knowledge system.

Shari Caudron discloses Sales-force automation comes of age. (includes related article on how Hewlett-Packard Co. Computer Systems Group implemented technology-enabled selling applications); Industry Week, v245, n10, p146(4), May 20, 1996.

However, none of the prior art cited above teaches/ fairly suggests "defining a configured product satisfying the customer's needs and the desired option selections using one or more solvers containing logic rules constraining selection of available product options; and identifying from the inventory of the selling entity one or more available products that most closely matches the configured product having the desired option selections of the customer based on the value input associated with the desired options selections, when an identified available product that exactly corresponds to the configured product is not found in the inventory of the selling entity".

Independent claim 11 is directed to "defining a configured product found within the inventory of the selling entity satisfying the needs of the customer and the desired option selections using one or more solvers containing logic rules constraining selection of available product options; and presenting to the customer by utilizing the computer system with one or more configured products found in the inventory of the selling entity that most closely matches the desired option selections specified by the customer based on the value input associated with the desired option selections, when the one or more configured products found in the inventory of the selling entity contain less than all the desired selection option selections specified by the customer".

However, none of the prior art cited above teaches/ fairly suggests "defining a configured product found within the inventory of the selling entity satisfying the needs of

the customer and the desired option selections using one or more solvers containing

logic rules constraining selection of available product options; and presenting to the

customer by utilizing the computer system with one or more configured products found

in the inventory of the selling entity that most closely matches the desired option

selections specified by the customer based on the value input associated with the

desired option selections, when the one or more configured products found in the

inventory of the selling entity contain less than all the desired selection option selections

specified by the customer".

Independent claim 18 is directed to "a configuration engine, operatively coupled

to the memory arrangement and user interface, that (i) receives a value input

associated with each desired option selection ranking the importance of each of the

desired option selection, (ii) defines configured product satisfying the customer's needs

and the desired option selections using one or more solvers containing logic rules

constraining selection of available product options, and (iii) identifies from the stored

product inventory information of the selling entity one or more available products that

most closely matches the configured product having the desired option selections of the

customer based on the value input associated with the desired option selections, when

an identified available product that exactly corresponds to the configured product is not

found in the stored product inventory information of the selling entity".

However, none of the prior art cited above teaches/ fairly suggests "a

configuration engine, operatively coupled to the memory arrangement and user

interface, that (i) receives a value input associated with each desired option selection

ranking the importance of each of the desired option selection, (ii) defines configured

product satisfying the customer's needs and the desired option selections using one or

more solvers containing logic rules constraining selection of available product options,

and (iii) identifies from the stored product inventory information of the selling entity one

or more available products that most closely matches the configured product having the

desired option selections of the customer based on the value input associated with the

desired option selections, when an identified available product that exactly corresponds

to the configured product is not found in the stored product inventory information of the

selling entity".

Claims 2-7, 12-17 and 19-23 incorporate the features of claims 1, 11 and 18

through their dependencies, and are also allowed for the same reasons given above.

3.   Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later

than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably

accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on

Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Conclusion

4.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure. The cited but not the applied art (WO 90/11572) teaches

integrated electronic parts warehousing and distribution system and method (Epstein,

Morris [US/US]; 12 Pine Tree Drive, Kings Point, N.Y 11024 (US), October 4, 1990, however fails to disclose all the limitations claimed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vanel Frenel whose telephone number is 571-272-6769. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zeender, Ryan Florian can be reached on 571-272-6790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

V.F

Art Unit 3627

August 14, 2007